

"1. Study Title : ""Journey into SPACE: Evidence-based Design of an App to Reduce Digital Addiction""

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed qualitative feedback from users about their experiences and outcomes.

Rater 2 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed qualitative feedback from app users, such as perceptions of peer norms and the survey items used in the study(Research impact toolkit)

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission covers deeper specifics on educational impacts through curriculum integration and industry-driven partnerships for behavioral change advocacy, which are less detailed in the AI version. Additionally, aspects such as specific DA intervention frameworks were omitted in the AI summary.

Rater 4 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF report includes specific download figures, user engagement metrics, and qualitative feedback from app store reviews, adding richness to the impact narrative that was generalized in AI. Additionally, the community-centered 'SPACE@Communities' program was discussed in REF but not reflected in the AI content.

"

"2. Study Title : Using Macroprudential Policies to Reduce the Risk of Financial Crises

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Specific policy engagements, such as the presentations at the IMF events and the detailed discussions about the adoption of the CDMs by financial institutions, are mentioned in the REF version but not fully captured in the AI version. 2. The role of NiGEM in evaluating macroprudential policy within specific country models (Germany, Italy, and the UK) is more comprehensively covered in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The impact of research on the Norges Bank regulator (Finanstilsynet) and specific forecasting improvements in macroeconomic policies.

Rater 3 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholders (NIESR, Norges Bank, IMF) and their role in macroprudential and NiGEM modeling.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Role of the National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR) in macroeconomic policy and further breakdown of specific fiscal impacts in the UK and other OECD countries.

"

"3. Study Title : Utilising the human-canine relationship to support vulnerable people in the criminal justice system

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provided precise numbers regarding trained professionals (e.g., 90 ABE interviewers, 150 officers) and specific training events such as the workshop at the 2019 International Courthouse Dogs conference.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes extensive details on educational programs for police officers and social workers, which led to procedural changes across various police forces. There is also a detailed account of how facility dogs were used in Achieving Best Evidence (ABE) interviews and the legislative changes related to this. These elements were not fully captured in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impact examples in Achieving Best Evidence (ABE) interview practices in the UK criminal justice system and precise implementation in various police forces were more detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Training and educational programs involving approximately 90 ABE interviewers and 150 officers across multiple forces are well-detailed in the REF, emphasizing the widespread adoption of standards for facility dogs, which is not as detailed in the AI version.

"
"4. Study Title : Embedding responsible practices into business by taking inspiration from the Quakers

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission emphasized the creation of community-benefit structures, such as Norwich Mustard's partnership with Norwich Prison, which provided pre-release work opportunities to inmates, an element that was absent in the AI version. The specific impacts on community engagement were more robust in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed discussion of how QBM principles were used to meet specific Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), such as SDG 13 (Climate Action) and SDG 8 (Decent Work). This granular focus on SDG alignment is missing in the AI-generated analysis.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed descriptions of stakeholder adoption steps and community initiatives, such as specific SDG priorities integrated into The Quiet Company's strategic plan and Norwich Mustard Cooperative's employment programs with local communities.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The AI version omits references to specific practices such as silent reflection as part of QBM's unique governance framework and their contribution to inclusivity within decision-making meetings.

"
"5. Study Title : Hope 4 The Community CIC: Improving Lives of People Living with Long-Term Health Conditions by providing Self-Management Tools

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The economic impact of the social enterprise, such as reinvestment of profits and employment creation, is covered in the REF submission. Specifics regarding the creative arts for well-being and regional policy shifts (e.g., NHS adoption of Hope Programs) are missing from the AI-generated content .

Rater 2 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific participant demographics and trial sizes (e.g., colorectal and multiple sclerosis trials). - International collaboration efforts, such as the Ontario Health Technology Fund project.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed metrics such as income generation and job creation via Hope For The Community CIC were in the REF version but were generalized in the AI report. REF's community impact through local partnerships also had more granularity.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) Financial data, such as revenue generated and reinvestment, 2) International collaborations, like the Ontario Health Technology Fund project, 3) Specific event data like Gratitude Wall and Writing Gym.

"
"6. Study Title : Localisation of Electricity Generation and Use

Rater 1 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of Hestia units and their commercialization via Exergy Devices Ltd, the environmental benefit through reduced carbon emissions, and specific financial benefits achieved in the trial stage (e.g., supermarket vouchers, energy savings).

Rater 2 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The community-specific impacts (e.g., savings in Bethesda) and the evolution of the Energy Local initiative into a social enterprise are more deeply explored in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Emphasis on policy influence, the step-by-step engagement with regulators, and the foundational role of collaboration with organizations like Co-op Energy and Octopus Energy.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed chronological development of spin-outs; engagement specifics with consumers (e.g., savings as supermarket vouchers); role of companies like Exergy Devices and Moixa in field trials;

grant-funding details for community energy trials.

"
"7. Study Title : Critical Connections pedagogical model based on multilingualism and digital storytelling boosts language learning and digital skills

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific partnerships and locations (e.g., Taiwan, Algeria), detailed feedback from organizations like NRCSE and ECML, teacher workshops in multiple countries, involvement of complementary schools.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed references to public film screenings, specific educational conferences, and partnerships with cultural organizations like the British Museum and British Film Institute are mentioned in the REF submission but not fully covered in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF details additional pedagogical resources (e.g., the handbook for teachers, the pedagogical resource pack), various types of events organized, and the roles of participating institutions (e.g., ECML, NRCSE). It also includes insights into specific international outreach efforts.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific events such as the annual film festivals and public screenings, where students presented their multilingual stories, are covered in detail in the REF submission but are less emphasized in the AI-generated content. These events underscore the project's outreach and community impact.

"
"8. Study Title : Helping to Sustain the UK's Independent Film Industry Through an Improved Risk Management Strategy

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version mentioned the UK Screen Sector's detailed policy recommendations, the formation of working groups with the DCMS, and impacts on industry funding and tax environments. These details provide a comprehensive view of the impact on industry policies, which were not fully elaborated in the AI-generated version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version offers greater detail on international partnerships, including the Mallen Scholars and Practitioners Conference and specific collaborations with film hubs in Los Angeles and New York.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Minor details on specific industry bodies' contributions, such as the Creative Scotland Screen Unit, and precise stakeholder roles in driving change.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The original REF document includes specific step-by-step policy recommendations, including FAANG engagement and EIS finance schemes, which are detailed as influencing the UK film industry's investment landscape.

"
"9. Study Title : Changing practice and improving wellbeing through immersive vocal art

Rater 1 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission describes specific numbers (e.g., 4000+ students using teaching materials, specific feedback from school teachers on pedagogical impacts) and concrete examples of impact on children with profound disabilities. The AI version is less detailed in these areas.

Rater 2 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed engagement with local educational institutions, the long-term impact on disabled children's wellbeing, and collaboration with educational authorities to integrate this work into the curriculum.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Detailed user feedback (children with PMLD and mainstream audiences). 2. Educational integration feedback from educators and school groups.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version offered data-driven insights, such as app download metrics and visit counts at installations,

and feedback from educators, which enhanced the comprehensiveness of its impact analysis.

"10. Study Title : Safewards: Increasing Safety on Psychiatric Inpatient Wards

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The explicit roles of NHS stakeholders, such as the Care Quality Commission and NIHR's Forward Thinking report, are strongly emphasized in the REF submission but are only indirectly referenced in the AI-generated version. There is also a lack of concrete numbers in terms of the global user base of the Safewards website and the reach of the social media channels like Twitter and Facebook, which were detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed descriptions of how Safewards' implementation was supported through social media, YouTube training videos, and the global community built around the model were covered in the REF submission but only mentioned briefly in the AI version. Additionally, specific implementation statistics, such as the number of healthcare trusts involved, were more comprehensive in the REF version.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details of governmental and healthcare endorsements (e.g., NICE, Department of Health), international adoption statistics, and detailed metrics showcasing reduced incidents of conflict and restraint.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed quantitative metrics on conflict reduction outcomes (e.g., specific percentages of restraint reduction in Sussex Partnership), examples of institutional endorsements like CQC.

"

"11. Study Title : Contemporary documentary practices: historical perspective and interdisciplinary approaches - the International Research Centre for Interactive Storytelling (IRIS)

Rater 1 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed academic contributions like the impact on Leeds Trinity modules and broader educational impacts at institutions like UWE and Swinburne are well-documented in the REF version but not fully captured in the AI version. Additionally, the cultural preservation efforts, such as the documentation of Japanese mediums, are more thoroughly explored in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on the collaborative workshops and community actions, such as saving a public gallery from foreign ownership and specific actions with local government.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details about university modules influenced by the research, mention of collaborative impacts with city officials and cultural organizations in Bosnia, and individual contributions of project members.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: VR workshops used in documentary training and specific audience engagement metrics for events and modules across disciplines.

"

"12. Study Title : Improving patient outcomes through better project management of clinical trials

Rater 1 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific savings and efficiencies identified in LEO Pharma and Blau Farmaceutica's integration of project management methods into their operational processes. The details of strategic partnership development, such as GSK's feedback on the CURED framework, were also less detailed in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed savings from specific companies (such as Blau's Standard Operating Procedures and LEO Pharma's change order elimination) were missing from the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific contractual impacts (e.g., cost and time savings in H. Lundbeck and LEO Pharma's adoption of the framework) and targeted stakeholder feedback (e.g., GSK staff responses).

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Case-specific impacts (e.g., cost savings for Leo Pharma and time efficiencies in GSK trials), along with policy-related implications via ICR engagement.

"

"13. Study Title : Ensuring the Fair Treatment of Open Banking Customers

Rater 1 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provided a more detailed account of how the research directly led to changes in FCA guidelines, such as extending the Principles for Business to other payment service providers, which the AI version did not explore in detail.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed steps of FCA's rule-making and the involvement of multiple stakeholders (e.g., Open Banking Implementation Entity, FSCP) were more fully fleshed out in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission mentions the timeline of policy influence more specifically, including dates and organizational responses, and details about specific guidance developments for Open Banking, consent dashboards, and OBIE activities.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed accounts of FSCP's position on informed consent, regulatory discussions, and exact dates of consultations and papers, adding specificity to the REF version's comprehensiveness.

"

"14. Study Title : Advancing Movement Practices in Doctoral and Professional Contexts

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The AI version does not fully capture the depth of international partnerships, such as Artistic Doctorates in Europe (ADiE) and their specific outcomes on HEIs across Nordic countries.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed references to specific workshops, geographical outreach (e.g., Taiwan, Brazil), and artistic doctoral collaborations with European institutions were underexplored.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed participant feedback from workshops and courses, specific growth in online viewership, and insights on ADiE's specific country-level impacts.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version discusses CAP's influence on doctoral candidates, stakeholders like Dance4, and network formations that fostered artist-researcher connections, impacting institutions in the UK and the Nordic regions. Additionally, the REF version notes CAP's structured guidance in post-pandemic arts education adaptations.

"

"15. Study Title : Digital Twin Specification, Design and Application

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The AI version missed out on significant aspects such as the impact on COVID-19 modeling in Pune using the TwinX™ Java library and specific industry applications like parcel sorting terminal optimization.

Rater 2 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Key business outcomes from collaborations with TCS, like client satisfaction improvements, specific revenue generation, and real-world demonstrators (such as optimizing telecom processes).

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Regional implementations, such as those in Vietnam, with details on outcomes like traffic improvements and maintenance savings, are not detailed in the AI version. Additionally, specific collaborative details with TCS and their strategic impact on ESL and TwinX™ development are less explicit.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Explicit discussion of ESL-based machine learning applications in client scenarios. 2. Details on

structural health monitoring contributions to specific Vietnamese government projects, particularly bridge repair and traffic flow improvement. 3. The role of TCS-funded PhD programs in sustaining and expanding digital twin research capacity.

"

"16. Study Title : Being in Touch: Inspiring Cultural Engagement through Creative-Critical Writing

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed breakdown of specific workshops, partnerships, and international creative-critical writing programs like the Katowice workshops and workshops in UNESCO Creative Cities.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed descriptions of community engagement through workshops in multiple countries (e.g., Ireland, Poland), specific BBC program appearances, and exact audience demographics were more extensively covered in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: - Nuanced descriptions of specific program activities (e.g., the role of telephony in poetry workshops, storytelling through multimedia). - Directly cited feedback from event participants.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Demographic diversity details (e.g., diversity of ages, professions, ethnic backgrounds) and iterative engagement across workshops (e.g., UNESCO collaborations).

"

"17. Study Title : Shaping crime prevention policy and strategy to sustain the crime drop and reduce domestic burglary

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of local initiatives like the Nottingham Crime and Drugs Partnership and the exact cost-savings from the implementation of the WIDE strategy are more detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version extensively covered the Nottingham Crime and Drugs Partnership's local initiative, as well as the detailed cost-benefit analysis of burglary prevention. It also mentioned specific governmental workshops and committees that were not fully elaborated in the AI-generated content.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: None; the AI-generated content comprehensively includes all critical impacts and stakeholders identified in the REF submissions.

Rater 4 Rating = [4] Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The original submission provides granular details about specific governmental and local crime prevention policies influenced, such as the Modern Crime Prevention Strategy (MCPS), which are missing from ChatGPT's coverage.

"

"18. Study Title : Building local socio-economic impacts into the assessment of major energy projects

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) Detailed focus on crime management initiatives during construction phases. 2) Real-time impact monitoring on specific metrics like workforce number increases and local crime rates. 3) EDF's revisions of workforce and housing plans based on specific audit results from the research.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed analysis of stakeholder involvement, specific government reactions, and the monitoring of socio-economic impacts during different project stages.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Less emphasis on the specific methodologies used for impact monitoring and less detail on the local socio-economic data used.

Rater 4 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific project names and localized policy impact data that provide concrete context for the study.

"

"19. Study Title : Strengthening global and national policies on performance-based and innovative health financing in low-income and fragile settings

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides deeper insights into country-specific implementations, such as the role of PBF in post-Ebola recovery efforts in Sierra Leone, and direct impacts on national health financing in Zimbabwe. These case-specific impacts are less emphasized in ChatGPT.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed examination of the impact on national policy, such as in Zimbabwe and Sierra Leone. Specific collaborations with DFID and Global Fund mentioned in the REF submission but not in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version included direct involvement of WHO e-learning initiatives and DFID consultations, which were less emphasized in the AI-generated version. Specific project sites in Zimbabwe and Sierra Leone were also noted in the REF version, along with direct influence on HRH profiles and localized healthcare strategies post-Ebola in Sierra Leone.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed involvement of national governments (e.g., Zimbabwe and Sierra Leone), WHO's health financing training for 40+ countries, and direct impact on technical guidelines for fragile settings used by WHO and Global Fund.

"

"20. Study Title : Transforming the Accessibility and Discoverability of Millions of Archival Television Programmes

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed role of collaborations with broadcasters, universities, and the specificity of user data (such as the number of playlists created or the precise contributions of the Learning on Screen's BoB service) is more elaborated in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed case studies of users engaging with the BoB platform for educational purposes, specific partnerships (such as with the Polish National Film Archive), and the technical evolution of the platform through user testing.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on user engagement feedback and practical challenges faced during early platform stages.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: RHUL's specific involvement in developing the "Hands-on History" video series, which documents archival production processes, and their work with media professionals and technical experts, were more explicitly addressed in the REF version.

"

"21. Study Title : Improving quality of life for patients with Parkinson's disease

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version provides extensive detail on specific NICE guideline recommendations, the role of expert witnesses, and rehabilitation therapy trials, which are either missing or less detailed in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed cost-saving figures and treatment outcome percentages (e.g., use of levodopa).

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Long-term surgical impact, detailed NICE and Canadian guideline changes on surgical intervention, and health economics analysis specifics tied to NHS savings

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission comprehensively includes underlying trials (PD MED, PD SURG, PD REHAB) and their individual contributions to specific impact areas, such as economic savings through DBS and levodopa use, which were not fully itemized in the AI version.

"

"22. Study Title : Improving Treatment for Women Suffering from Endometrial Hyperplasia
Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission offers a deeper analysis of adoption rates, patient choices, and international guideline changes, which are not as comprehensively covered in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = [Rating: 3]

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: NHS cost analysis and environmental impact considerations related to fewer surgeries.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific uptake statistics of LNG-IUS over the REF period, exact phrasing from organizations like the British Gynaecological Cancer Society, and intricate details of patient outcomes reported from UK-specific data.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific statistical data on the growth of non-invasive treatment adoption rates, feedback from practitioners' survey data, and an impact narrative detailing the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists' role in guideline transformation.

"

"23. Study Title : Heritage of the first farmers

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific quotes from local residents, detailed visitor feedback, and personalized contributions to museum curatorial activities are missing.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impacts on the local educational system, including the role of the visitor center in enhancing the Turkish school curriculum. Testimonials from Turkish teachers and students.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed community feedback (e.g., comments from local children about the significance of heritage) and specific outreach resources, such as the educational booklet distributed to local schools.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed descriptions of training provided to museum staff, feedback from local schools on educational resources, and comprehensive details on collaborations with the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

"

"24. Study Title : Mathematical modelling of an aneurysm sealing system triggers patient safety policy that withdraws surgical practice from the NHS

Rater 1 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed policy changes, such as the exact dates of withdrawal from the NHS, the Medical Device Alert references, and specific quotes from clinical collaborators.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed failure rates of Nellix EVAS and traditional EVAR systems, as well as specific patient numbers (e.g., 611 patients affected).

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed patient data, including mortality statistics linked to endoleaks and comparisons of EVAS and traditional EVAR outcomes. Specific hospital adoption and procedural changes in response to the policy shift, particularly in Liverpool.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed patient benefit examples (e.g., numbers of patients avoiding Nellix EVAS), and clinical guidance issued by the MHRA. Greater focus on case-based impacts and surveillance practices.

"

"25. Study Title : Financial and efficiency improvements from socio-technical digitalization of costing and procurement in the built environment

Rater 1 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific adoption of

procurement policies within government departments, financial savings of hundreds of thousands of pounds, and detailed stakeholder contributions from major construction firms like Redrow and H&H Celcon.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed economic benefits, such as the exact financial figures (e.g., savings of hundreds of thousands of pounds) and direct policy impacts on governmental procurement.

Rater 3 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Direct monetary impacts, government policy adoption specifics, and feedback from contractors citing the socio-technical improvements as tied to reduced project uncertainties and rework.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Testimonials and specific financial figures (e.g., savings percentages) from major stakeholders like WD and NGB; details on specific subcontractor relationships and reductions in project uncertainties due to digital adoption.

"

"26. Study Title : Evaluating Effectiveness

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed examples from Cartwright's collaborative work, such as her influence on QuIP, NICE, and specific policy guidelines like the 'Methods of Evaluating Evidence' report.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission included detailed accounts of policy document contributions and individual testimonials from key stakeholders such as CEDIL, the World Bank, and NICE, which were less emphasized in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholder testimonials and case applications in programs like CEDIL and the Working Well Program were not directly referenced.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit economic implications, e.g., reference to GBP 10 million research commissioned by CEDIL, granular impacts on healthcare through policy design adjustments.

"

"27. Study Title : Seeing beyond the wheelchair: Pioneering education and higher aspiration promotion for boys and men with Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: SEND reforms, workshops, and tribunal involvement for DMD support.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed numbers of copies sold, the scale of engagement with different educational sectors, and some targeted interventions, such as specific workshops for healthcare professionals and educators, are more explicitly detailed in the REF version.

Rater 3 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholders and events, such as exact numbers of children, families, and professionals involved in various workshops and advocacy events.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impacts like presentations at European Neuromuscular Centre and collaboration with DMD Pathfinders for mentorship were detailed in the REF submission.

"

"28. Study Title : The Coffee Historian: Achieving Impact Through Industry Collaboration, Education, and Public Engagement

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed descriptions of specific collaborations (e.g., Gruppo Cimbali and Mulmar) and media appearances (e.g., BBC, Radio 4) are richer in the REF submission, particularly in terms of public engagement.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Public engagement through media channels such as podcasts and international media appearances, which showcased Morris's wide-reaching influence in non-academic spheres, are more detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific achievements in collaborations with Gruppo Cimbali, as well as media appearances on major platforms (e.g., BBC, CBC), which add to public engagement comprehensiveness.

Rater 4 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Minor details on the contributions to specific industry partners such as Ecocafe and regulatory assistance specific to the Swiss market.

"

"29. Study Title : Discovering Ted Hughes's Yorkshire

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed activities, such as funded trail creation, specific grant information (e.g., £9,800 in funding), and targeted community involvement (such as the engagement of schools and underprivileged communities in South Yorkshire), were omitted from the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborations like the THP(SY) literary festival, the detailed map trails, and workshops with community groups and schools are missing from the AI-generated content.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of funded activities, such as map creation and trail launches, and the impact of specific events in East Yorkshire.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The consortium's influence on academic discourse and internal training provided to stakeholders were more comprehensively covered in the REF, demonstrating its role as a research-led organization.

"

"30. Study Title : Empowering Indigenous Self-Representation for the Emberá People of Panama

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed accounts of the legal precedents set by the land claims and the partnerships with organizations like Forests of the World.

Rater 2 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Legal documentation regarding the 2020 land claim submission, as well as the integration of modern practices into tourism narratives from 2011 to 2019, were more thoroughly described in the REF version.

Rater 3 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides a sequential narrative on the transition of tourism practices and internal discussions on "authenticity" within the Emberá community, focusing on generational shifts in identity perceptions and the integration of modern Indigenous narratives.

Rater 4 Rating = [5] Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific local community actions taken post-2019 to further land rights.

"

"31. Study Title : Enhancing Understanding of the Foreign and Security Policy Implications of Brexit for Government and the Wider Policy Community

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific engagements with think tanks like Chatham House, direct participation in media outlets such as The Financial Times, and the influence on parliamentary select committee reports.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission elaborates more on the specific relationships built with think tanks like Chatham House, specific workshops, and high-level government briefings, which are either generalized or missing in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF submission

includes detailed examples, like Whitman's invited presentations to specific parliamentary committees and international consultations, which are not addressed in the AI-generated version.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed engagements with international policymakers, especially interactions with the US State Department and Australian diplomatic missions.

"

"32. Study Title : Worldwide Improvements in Policing due to Increased Sales of Facial Composite Software

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version provides extensive details on the geographic deployment of the software, training provided to over 300 officers worldwide, and its use in high-profile cases such as the ""Beeston Bus Stop"" rape case in the UK.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission is more specific regarding the financial success of Visionmetric Ltd., providing sales data from key markets and examples of media visibility (e.g., Bodyguard drama). Furthermore, it includes more detail on training initiatives across multiple countries.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific international regions adopting the software and real-life case results demonstrating improved policing effectiveness.

Rater 4 Rating = 5: Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Some highly specific data on the exact growth in user count across years and qualitative feedback from users in criminal investigations is more detailed in the REF submission.

"

"33. Study Title : Improving the Physical Wellbeing of the Police Force

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed interim evaluation reports, participant feedback, and the award recognition of the 'Protecting the Workforce' award.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Post-program feedback, detailed health metrics (e.g., BMI improvements), and long-term participant engagement.

Rater 3 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Comprehensive details on mentor recruitment and training, post-program evaluations, and the specific timeline of program rollout and evaluations.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on the 10-week structure of the program, mentor requirements, and specific feedback from participants regarding health improvements like BMI changes and exercise regularity.

"

"34. Study Title : Raising Maori students' achievement in secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand

Rater 1 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific teacher training outcomes and their impacts on educational leadership were emphasized more in the REF submission. The detailed school reform process (e.g., the specific number of schools conducting teacher observations and coaching sessions) is not covered in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: In-depth data about individual teacher and school participation, specifics of the KEP evaluation, and measured improvements in student achievement and engagement, as well as detailed outcomes from classroom observations and leadership team discussions.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific survey statistics, like the percentage improvement in student retention and attainment, and unique engagement details, like "evidence-to-accelerate" meetings, were only in the REF.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Quantitative data on

school-level and student-level changes (e.g., percentages of schools achieving specific milestones) and detailed evidence of specific community engagement sessions were included in the REF but not in the AI version.

"
"35. Study Title : Improving patient outcomes and treatment guidelines through the study of Hepatitis C

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission extensively discusses clinical trials, the Early Access Programme, and collaboration with Public Health England (PHE) to refine treatment strategies. It also includes statistical evidence of treatment success and mortality reduction.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission goes into greater detail regarding 'reflex testing' and its impact on patient outcomes, particularly in reducing drop-out rates. Additionally, it discusses the cascade of care in greater depth.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF document detailed specific partnerships with NHS Trusts, mentions of certain DAAs, and the national framework around Sofosbuvir. Additionally, it referenced WHO and PHE statistics directly supporting the impact on HCV patient outcomes.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed roles of DAAs, extensive stakeholder collaborations, and specific patient demographics.

"
"36. Study Title : Improving Homecare Quality in the UK Through Optimized Workforce Planning

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes more specific client testimonials and quantifiable impacts (e.g., GBP 4,500 savings by Rest Assured Homecare), which are not present in the AI-generated version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Client testimonials, operational impact during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed benefits on job satisfaction and quality of care specifically provided by OptifAI for home healthcare.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF document provided concrete savings metrics, like cost savings by specific clients, which were not quantified in the AI version.

"
"37. Study Title : Transforming vaccine policy for pneumococcal disease leading to significant cost savings in the NHS

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission offers detailed insight into the cost-effectiveness modeling used by JCVI and its direct impact on UK adult vaccine policies. It also discusses the longitudinal surveillance data and its continued use to inform future policy decisions.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics on childhood vaccine schedules, economic savings.

Rater 3 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed information on the JCVI's ongoing reliance on study data for decision consistency and implications on childhood vaccination policy is more pronounced in the REF.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed role of the assay's detection expansion from 14 to 24 serotypes, influencing the JCVI's decision against universal adult PCV13 vaccination. Specific details on advisory roles for the JCVI's vaccine decision processes were also more explicitly mentioned in the REF version.

"
"38. Study Title : UoP32Househistories: A House Through Time: Shaping a flagship TV series to

achieve critical and financial success and inspiring the public to engage with house history
Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborations with industry partners like FindMyPast and detailed information on how Ryan's expertise shaped particular episodes of the series (e.g., domestic lives of working-class people). Additionally, the REF submission explains the role of public talks, social media engagement, and special programs like #HouseHistoryHour.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission details the program's influence on genealogical research trends, specific public lectures, and archival contributions that are not fully developed in the AI version. The AI content also misses the precise contributions to policy influence on public broadcasting or specific awards and recognition.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The academic rigor of contributions to series content, specific series collaborations, and audience engagement statistics.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes targeted media engagement, like Ryan's involvement with FindMyPast and specific libraries and archives that created resources in response to public demand. It also details collaborative events with notable figures, which were absent in the AI version.

"
"39. Study Title : Optimising baggage operations at London Heathrow Airport to achieve cost savings for the aviation industry

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Concrete economic impacts (e.g., Heathrow saved airlines £10 million annually by reducing short-landed baggage rates), and specific stakeholder testimonials from Arup and Heathrow.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Specific collaborations with external stakeholders like Arup. 2. Concrete statistics on the impact (e.g., baggage handling improvements). 3. Broader industrial collaboration efforts and their long-term implications for the airline industry.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed financial impacts, including exact cost savings in GBP and references to the GBP16bn contract with Arup, were mentioned in the REF submission but not in the AI content.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The historical progression and funding details of the collaboration with Heathrow and Arup's use of the research in their consultancy were more comprehensively detailed in the REF submission.

"
"40. Study Title : POWeR - Cost-effective online support for weight management

Rater 1 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes thorough explanations of the clinical trials, ESRC funding, and dissemination protocols, which were less explored in the AI-generated version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed processes of obtaining grants and the specific partnership mechanisms with Changing Health were covered in the REF submission but were either simplified or omitted in the AI version. The in-depth longitudinal study details and the variety of target populations (e.g., Royal Navy, new mothers) were also more thoroughly discussed in the REF version.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Extensive details on primary care adaptation, community partnerships, local authority collaborations, and contract negotiations for scaling POWeR across different UK regions.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed funding timelines (e.g., NIHR and Innovate UK grants), specific data on user demographics, targeted NHS resources, and community reach across local councils.

"

"41. Study Title : The global impact of Sunderland's football research on scouting, training, and player preparation in elite football

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed influence on specific football clubs (e.g., Manchester United, FC Barcelona), national Olympic committees, and football federations, along with exact numbers and studies cited for these impacts.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes more granular details about the specific clubs and associations (e.g., Olympic Committees, American Football teams) that implemented the research findings.

Rater 3 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed examples involving national federations, Olympic Committees, and specific clubs that utilized the research in training and performance strategies are missing in the AI analysis.

Rater 4 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed methodology regarding ProZone data acquisition techniques and mention of specific datasets used for EPL player movement tracking.

"

"42. Study Title : Adding value to convenience retailing through improved pricing, a new store concept, and capacity building

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific industry figures, such as revenue impact, precise stakeholder involvement, and consumer feedback surveys were well covered in the REF version but not fully detailed in the AI-generated version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Capacity-building activities like the establishment of the ""Convenience Leadership Programme"" were not mentioned. 2. Specific sales increases of 18.4% (without tobacco) and other performance metrics across store chains were omitted.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit sales growth percentages, precise consumer demographic focus, and qualitative testimonials regarding the success of capacity-building initiatives.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF highlights changes in the client-side pricing strategy and the role of consumer workshops in adopting new approaches, detailing impacts on stakeholders, like the ACS and wholesale sector, with quantitative and qualitative outcomes.

"

"43. Study Title : Transforming Evidence-Based Practice in Public Health Through Co-Production and Evaluation

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: - Specific case examples, such as the youth mental health YAM program or the real-time suicide alert system pilot, were thoroughly discussed in the REF submission but received limited attention in the AI-generated version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: In-depth evaluations of programs, such as the specific continuation of the CREE service, the cost-benefit analysis leading to policy reforms, and the data-driven justification for program recommissioning.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics on individual program recommendations (e.g., for CREE and teenage pregnancy support) and granular details on DCC's policy implementations based on each evaluation.

Rater 4 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF emphasizes DCC's specific investment in public health-focused partnerships, such as joint funding allocations for program implementation and monitoring, which was not highlighted in the AI version.

"

"44. Study Title : Well-being and Public Policy

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: International well-being policy engagement, such as the European Commission consultations. - Detailed account of media and public dissemination, including publications in major media outlets like The Economist and The Daily Telegraph.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission discusses international recognition, including Oswald's lecture to policymakers at the European Commission and the World Happiness Reports, which are mentioned less specifically in the AI version. Additionally, the REF submission details the long-term work with the What Works Well-being Centre and its advisory capacity in policy design, which is not fully mirrored in the AI summary.

Rater 3 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific talks, consultative roles with HM Treasury, and citation frequency in government documents.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: References to specific UK government reports influenced by the research, such as the DWP and HM Treasury report (Fujiwara & Campbell, 2011), and some notable collaborations with ONS were underrepresented.

"

"45. Study Title : Improving the quality of green infrastructure in towns and cities in the UK

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific certification examples (e.g., West Cheltenham's Cyber Central Garden Community Supplementary Planning Document), and mentions of specific sites in Scotland.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details about the Building with Nature framework, national benchmarks, specific policies in Newcastle, and collaboration with city councils were more comprehensively described in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides detailed references to specific organizations involved, like Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and mentions of precise case studies and training programs initiated.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific influence on local policy adaptation, involvement in multiple stages of planning and maintenance, and particular impacts on local biodiversity and ecosystem diversity.

"

"46. Study Title : Redressing the state of the stateless: seeking political recognition for Tibet and Kashmir

Rater 1 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific activist interventions by Kaul in the media and their impact on Kashmir-related debates, as well as Anand's leadership in Tibetan activism, were more comprehensively covered in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific legal cases, such as the impact of Anand's work on asylum claims and judicial precedents, are more thoroughly detailed in the REF submission. The AI report lacks the emphasis on personal testimonials from activists and legal professionals that highlight the practical outcomes of the research.

Rater 3 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed impacts of specific asylum cases and House Resolutions on international policy debates about Kashmir are noted in the REF submission but generalized in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Extensive legal interventions by Anand, including guidance to legal bodies, and specific Congressional outcomes tied to Kaul's testimony were noted.

"

"47. Study Title : Evidence-based enteral feeding practices for very preterm or very low birth weight infants

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed national and international policy impacts such as specific guidelines adopted by organizations like the

European Association of Perinatal Medicine and the American Academy of Pediatrics were mentioned in the REF but not by AI.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission discusses the direct impact on training programs and educational resources for healthcare providers, which is not fully captured in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 3 Rating = 5: Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific training programs, especially the Oxford online module for practitioners, and references to national milk bank expansion details.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed examples, such as milk bank growth in North America, specific changes in AAP policies, and statistical evidence on NEC reductions.

"

"48. Study Title : Improving Environmental Conservation in East Africa and Beyond

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides more extensive coverage of economic aspects, such as job creation, eco-tourism, and specific revenue figures, which were not detailed to the same extent by ChatGPT.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Detailed economic impacts on local villages, such as revenues from tourism and contributions to education and employment. 2. Specific achievements in reducing illegal firewood collection and improved ranger patrols.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific numbers on local community economic benefits (e.g., revenue from eco-tourism) and training outcomes, which add depth to the economic impact but were less emphasized in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) Comprehensive data on community training programs, including stoves initiative; 2) Economic impacts from local employment and tourism revenue generation.

"

"49. Study Title : Predicting the properties of materials with first-principles electronic structure software (CASTEP)

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes more comprehensive data on the specific applications in the pharmaceutical and semiconductor sectors, and the mention of specific patents and technologies deployed by industries (e.g., Al-alloys by Honda, RRAM devices by Toshiba).

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The ROI of using CASTEP and the role it played in securing patents, particularly the detailed explanation of its role in 36 patents filed during the REF period, was not thoroughly covered in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 3 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF covers CASTEP's ongoing software updates, scalability, and industry-specific metrics, which are lacking in AI-generated impacts.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details of the training workshops and specific industry-academic partnerships like ADDoPT were elaborated in the REF submission. Additionally, individual company applications and feedback from workshops were also more detailed.

"

"50. Study Title : Statistical pattern recognition applied to protein crystallisation images in the pharmaceutical industry

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed impact on specific industrial partners, like the role of Formulatrix and the incorporation of MARCO into their systems (mentioned in the REF submission), was not thoroughly addressed in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides detailed methodologies (e.g., texture feature extraction and wavelet transforms) and specific details on data mining approaches in collaboration with companies. The use of MARCO by Formulatrix is also more thoroughly explained in the REF version.

Rater 3 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Testimonials from major companies (e.g., AstraZeneca) and the success rate specifics of crystallization experiments were detailed in REF but missed in ChatGPT's version.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed examples of use cases (e.g., AstraZeneca and C3's specific automation achievements), and the specific ROI benefits described by Merck and other companies.

"

"51. Study Title : 'Moving beyond one-size-fits-all: Improving Widening Participation through Realist Evaluation methodologies in Northern England'

Rater 1 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: In-depth explanation of how mentoring schemes differed between institutional and community settings. Specific activities such as local graduates' involvement in outreach efforts and community-based initiatives like career-focused housing. (REF submission: [8] pages 3.2, 5.3)

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version emphasizes the detailed outcomes of specific projects like the mentoring schemes, the role of local graduates as role models, and the effectiveness of these initiatives in breaking down access barriers in educational settings. It also discusses the broader strategic aims of embedding RE in a national framework.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: In-depth community engagement examples, including local graduate roles in outreach and the effect of place-based initiatives.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version included detailed evaluations of mentoring variations across settings ("effective vs. affective" mentoring in different contexts) and specific partnerships' influence on program theories, which were not as extensively discussed in the AI-generated version.

"

"52. Study Title : Challenging monolithic conceptualisations of English for learning, teaching and assessment: The Changing Englishes online course

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The detailed statistics about course participation, geographic reach, and specific changes in teaching practices are missing in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The global adoption of the Changing Englishes course in university curricula (e.g., UK, Malaysia, Hong Kong) and its presence in journals and conferences was omitted.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific numbers regarding course registrations, certifications, geographic reach (number of countries, unique visitors), and specific application examples (e.g., integration in curricula in Hong Kong, the UK, Latvia).

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version includes detailed metrics such as the number of course registrants and countries involved, as well as specific evidence of practice changes among educators (e.g., translanguaging and focus on communicative competence), which are not comprehensively represented in the AI version.

"

"53. Study Title : Robert Paul and the Origins of British Cinema

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version is more comprehensive in describing public exhibitions, collaboration with museums, and educational impacts, such as the use of visual methods in exhibitions.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific collaborations with museums like the BFI, National Science and Media Museum, and the London Metropolitan Archives, including visitor engagement outcomes, are detailed in the REF submission but underrepresented in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF mentioned specific partnerships with the BFI and other institutions for film identification and restoration, alongside details about the public's reception of exhibitions, which were omitted in ChatGPT's version.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed discussion of exhibitions at the National Science and Media Museum and Bruce Castle, educational distribution of Time Traveller comics, and the unique design elements of exhibitions aimed at enhancing community interaction.

"

"54. Study Title : The Care and Management of Gout in Primary Care

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed discussions of stakeholder collaborations with groups like G-CAN and local clinical groups.

Rater 2 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The patient-facing educational materials, healthtalk.org involvement, and the Gout Nation report developed by Arthritis Care were emphasized in the REF submission but lacked prominence in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Specific citations of the BSR and EULAR guidelines, especially regarding regional endorsement. 2. Gout Awareness initiatives via Arthritis Care's Gout Nation report.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Comprehensive references to collaboration with specific organizations, like NICE and Versus Arthritis, and the exact contributions to guideline revisions.

"

"55. Study Title : From Victims to Actors: Shifting the Policy Paradigm to Value Children's Contribution in Disaster Risk Management

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to case studies, conferences, and the involvement of external organizations like Save the Children, the Environment Agency, and Surrey County Council were missing in the AI-generated version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed case studies such as the development of the Flood Suitcase, specific EU Horizon2020 connections, and collaboration with the Environment Agency's national policy strategies.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed description of specific events where children spoke to policymakers, individual agency responses such as the Environment Agency's policy shift, and engagement in national conferences in the UK.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on specific methodologies (e.g., photo elicitation, model-making) and specific international events and organizational partners like the EU CUIDAR program were extensively detailed in the REF.

"

"56. Study Title : Improved Crab Fisheries Management Benefits Coastal Livelihoods in Brazil

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes more granular detail on the strategic presentations and reports that were shared with policymakers to influence legislative changes. It also provides more comprehensive data on the implementation process of the new fisheries policies, specifically how mass-mating forecasts were integrated into laws.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version

provided detailed feedback from crab fishers and restaurant owners, along with concrete data on economic savings and legislative adoption (e.g., ""BRL 2.23 million saved""). Such data points were less specific in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 - Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Extensive policy detail, including specific legislative outcomes for different years and specific impacts on marginalized fishers, traders, and restaurant owners.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Numerical data on affected populations (crab fishers, traders, etc.), financial savings metrics, and compliance statistics from surveys conducted by ICMBio.

"

"57. Study Title : Influencing Organisational Strategy to Support Responsible Business Practice
Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of collaborations, such as with Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce and the role of Scotland CAN B in business sustainability, were more comprehensively explained in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed outcomes of the Impact Funding Partners (IFP) and the rebranding from Voluntary Action Fund, and specific mentions of business partnerships facilitated by Weaver's research.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Direct connections to the Impact Funding Partners' rebranding efforts and the Charity Board Initiative's expansion through corporate partnerships were more detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on the involvement of specific student programs and charity partnerships, particularly the Get on Board initiative, were not as fully detailed in the AI content.

"

"58. Study Title : Billmonitor: predicting the best mobile phone contract for businesses and individual users
Rater 1 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: - Detailed testimonials from clients like SMEs, health sector organizations, and private users. - Specific media coverage and social media engagement data supporting the reach and visibility of Billmonitor.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed cost savings for SMEs, specific testimonials from customers and industry, and quantitative data on public sector engagement, such as NHS usage.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific SME savings per annum, detailed user testimonials, and direct quotes from the Optimor Managing Director.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed data on the mobile contract market, specific statistics on user overcharges, and the high cost differential between providers, which the REF submission uses to illustrate the problem scale, are missing.

"

"59. Study Title : Mediating Modern German: reaching new and diverse audiences through translation, engagement, and performance
Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Detailed events like the ""Poetry Society Lecture"" by Jan Wagner and specific media programs like ""The Verb"" on Radio 3. 2. The specific mention of the Poetry Society Chair's comment on Leeder's influence. 3. The number of public readings and specific geographic locations (e.g., Germany, Italy, USA).

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed engagement with festivals (Cheltenham, Edinburgh), specific workshops, and media collaborations (BBC, Radio 3) are extensively covered in the REF submission but missing from the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific feedback and testimonials from event participants and organization leaders; detailed collaborations with

festivals; granular descriptions of award contributions and public feedback from radio listeners and event attendees.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes specific mentions of workshops, competition judging, and targeted public engagement initiatives.

"
"60. Study Title : OMass Therapeutics: New technology for drug discovery with economic benefit to the UK

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The growth of OMass Technologies into OMass Therapeutics, the company's geographical expansion (e.g., the acquisition of Excellerate), and detailed financial milestones are not well represented in the AI-generated content.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission included details about the acquisition of Excellerate and the specifics of the company's headcount growth and geographical presence in Oxford and Nottingham.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific economic figures, detailed investor profiles, and precise financial milestones reached by OMass were omitted in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed staff development data, including the increase from initial FTEs to over 30 specialized positions, was specific in the REF submission but generalized in AI's version.

"
"61. Study Title : Living With Feeling: Transforming Understandings of Emotional Health

Rater 1 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed audience feedback from the BBC series and podcasts, and the specific feedback from stakeholders like the RCN or Jewish Care Foundation. Specific metrics on engagement from public exhibitions.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific details about the success of public engagement (e.g., exact number of exhibition visitors, podcast awards, streaming numbers, and stakeholder quotes from events like the BBC Free Thinking Festival) were thoroughly documented in the REF submission but not emphasized in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The specific educational partnership with TKAT schools and the Developing Emotions program details.

Rater 4 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The original document provides specific metrics on user engagement, such as exhibition visitor numbers and specific collaboration outcomes, like stakeholder reflections and feedback, which add quantifiable value to comprehensiveness.

"
"62. Study Title : Litigation as a Tool to Support Social Change: Indigenous Peoples, Human Rights, and Legal Empowerment

Rater 1 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed references to MRG and the Batwa case, as well as specific UN-related policy shifts, are discussed in the REF submission but are not addressed in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides more detailed accounts of the impact on global legal institutions, such as the UN, and specific local policy shifts in countries like Kenya and Paraguay.

Rater 3 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Institutional impacts and partnerships, like the influence on OSJI's climate justice focus, case-specific outcomes in Namibia, and empowerment processes in the San community's legal journey.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Community-level

engagement and empowerment, especially concerning Namibia and legal practices for class-action lawsuits, were more detailed in the REF.

"

"63. Study Title : Accelerating the development of medicines for children through an open-access excipient database

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: - Detailed quantitative metrics on users of the database (e.g., 3000 users from 44 countries). - Specific references to major companies citing the database, such as GSK and Roche.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed case studies of Proveca's cost savings, specific excipient approvals facilitated by the STEP database, and detailed regulatory impact (e.g., citations by the EMA and Health Canada).

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed statistics on user demographics (e.g., 3000 users across 44 countries), and explicit financial sponsorships by organizations like the Gates Foundation.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on specific stakeholder engagement with pharmaceutical companies and financial impacts on smaller organizations (e.g., monetary savings for Proveca)

"

"64. Study Title : Pluralistic Evidence for Successful Policymaking about Reactive Systems

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The role of ethical frameworks for AI and data science, as well as consultations with the Cabinet Office, DCMS, and the Alan Turing Institute, which were significant parts of the REF submission, are not as detailed in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission elaborates more on the ethical frameworks for AI developed in collaboration with UK bodies, including the Cabinet Office and DCMS, which is less detailed in the AI version. It also explores post-publication impacts through ongoing consultations more thoroughly.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific committee consultations and detailed methodologies on pluralistic evidence inclusion in NICE/IARC guidelines are more elaborated in the REF version.

Rater 4 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: In-depth examples of NICE and IARC consultations, stakeholder engagement within DEG, and procedural changes directly influenced by the research.

"

"65. Study Title : Reshaping professional heritage practice and changing understanding of heritage in the UK and internationally

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to international partner organizations, such as the National Trust, and their role in co-designing heritage management workshops.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed descriptions of workshops, advisory board impacts, and the long-term nuclear waste repository event were specific to the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Quantitative data on public engagement (e.g., visitor statistics for exhibitions) and specific mentions of professional development impacts from workshops were highlighted in the REF submission but were less detailed in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed insights into co-created workshops with institutions like NT, British Library, and specifics about the exhibition's impact at Manchester Museum and related visitor feedback. The REF also emphasizes long-term impacts on organizations' internal practices and sector-wide learning.

"

"66. Study Title : Shaping the legal framework for Brexit
Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission details extensive engagement with parliamentary procedures, including key figures and specific committee inquiries, which are only lightly touched on in the ChatGPT-generated version.
Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: More comprehensive analysis of how the legal blog posts gained traction in legal and academic circles and were cited in various Parliamentary proceedings. The REF submission also includes the significant public debate that followed the Miller case.
Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Legal precedents specifically cited in court judgments, detailed blog post and media engagement specifics.
Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission detailed public engagement metrics, including blog readership statistics and extensive media coverage, which were not included in the AI summary.

"

"67. Study Title : Bristol's materials research is keeping the UK's fleet of nuclear power stations safe and operating.
Rater 1 Rating = 3
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific methodologies like electron backscatter diffraction and the creation of new testing rigs for high-temperature stress. UoB's advisory role in regulatory safety processes and partnership specifics with EDF Energy.
Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The original REF document provides more granular technical insights into specific procedures like the R5 standards used by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and detailed funding structures, which are not as detailed in the ChatGPT version.
Rater 3 Rating = 5: Excellent
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholder engagement activities (e.g., advisory roles for regulatory bodies and partnerships with EDF's technical centers).
Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed analysis of material behavior under real reactor conditions, and specific aging and cracking mechanisms related to CO₂ exposure.

"

"68. Study Title : Radical advance in treating age-related macular degeneration leading to global impact in prevention of blindness
Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific legal decisions, like the 2020 UK Court of Appeal case, and the WHO Essential Medicines List inclusion process are described in the REF submission but not fully explored in ChatGPT's analysis. The REF version also highlights specific healthcare savings examples, such as savings in the US healthcare system, which are less detailed in the AI-generated content.
Rater 2 Rating = 3 - Good
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Regional guidelines, such as the Indian Ministry of Health's reauthorization of bevacizumab and Brazil's Ministry of Health rejecting ranibizumab, were detailed in the REF submission but not captured in ChatGPT.
Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes specifics on national guidance adoption across multiple EU countries and the WHO Model List of Essential Medicines, which are less comprehensively outlined in the AI version.
Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)
CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission addresses local regulatory details, such as WHO Essential Medicines List and particularized decisions from health bodies (e.g., India, Brazil), which enhance the real-world applicability and impact in diverse regions, omitted in the AI content.

"

"69. Study Title : Rolling programme of research, centred on the National Joint Registry, to

improve the outcomes of hip and knee replacements worldwide

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes detailed numbers on financial savings for national health systems, specific mortality reduction data, and mentions of long-term clinical impacts like the increase in use of cemented stems. Detailed regulatory citations and outcomes of patient monitoring strategies were more emphasized in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific recommendations on reducing perioperative mortality rates and the improved patient care resulting from clinical interventions (e.g., chemical thromboprophylaxis).

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides more detail on the specific influence of individual studies (e.g., 2012 and 2018 studies) and the UK National Joint Registry's contribution to implant monitoring. Additionally, direct quotes from health bodies (e.g., Jo Churchill MP's mention in Parliament) contextualize the impact more granularly in the REF.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: In-depth monitoring and surveillance systems, specific cost savings per implant recommendation, NJR's continuous data collection influence on GIRFT programme.

"

"70. Study Title : Reducing breast and ovarian cancer occurrences in women at high risk

Rater 1 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specificity in usage statistics: The REF mentions that BOADICEA registered over 250,000 risk calculations in 2018 alone and highlights detailed geographical usage (e.g., 16,700 users globally).

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF includes broader social and clinical impacts, including specific collaborations with patient advocacy groups and national cancer organizations like FORCE in the United States, which leverage BOADICEA's personalized predictions for critical patient counseling and preventative decision-making. Also, the REF submission's detailed statistics on usage and patient outcomes provide a more robust view of the tool's clinical impact.

Rater 3 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed geographic usage metrics for CanRisk registrations and CE marking specifics for regulatory approvals.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed timeline and geographical adoption milestones (e.g., Canada, U.S., UK NHS-specific protocols) and particular usage data in countries, which provide quantitative evidence of reach.

"

"71. Study Title : The Haydn Scale: Changing policy and practice for improving pupil behaviour in schools

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) Feedback from various universities (e.g., Oxford, UCL) on the impact of Haydn's lectures. 2) Specific student testimonies from PGCE programs and other trainee evaluations.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed testimonials, such as the UCL and Oxford PGCE program feedback, provide specific evidence of the Haydn Scale's influence on teacher trainees, which the AI version doesn't replicate with similar specificity.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Noted details on specific testimonials from teacher trainees, explicit examples of classroom climate variations, and in-depth stakeholder interactions (e.g., University of Oxford's endorsement) were not fully explored in the AI-generated impacts.

Rater 4 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific feedback and testimonial summaries from institutions like UCL and Oxford, details of the NASBTT selection of Haydn's work, and the direct use of the Haydn Scale across various UK teacher training platforms.

"

"72. Study Title : ""Definitive demonstration of the adverse cardiovascular effects of air pollution leads to policy change at the local, national, and international level""

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF specifically details legislative advocacy steps, events, and policy engagements with figures like the Shadow Secretary of State.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific media strategies, the impact on BHF policy prioritization, government-level presentations, and dedicated campaigns influenced by the research.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed pathways to impact, including specific advocacy events, exact media engagements, and documented responses from policymakers, were noted only in the REF submission.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific campaigns and policy actions (e.g., ""Toxic Air: You're Full of It"" campaign) and details on legislative engagement (such as mentions of BHF's prioritization changes) were unique to the REF submission.

"

"73. Study Title : Navigating Inclusion in International Peace Processes

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Programming and resources designed specifically to enhance women's leadership in the Middle East peace processes, including PeaceFem app development and impact, and partnerships with UN Women and the OECD's International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF) for programmatic alignment and capacity building.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed capacity-building efforts with UN peace teams, PSRP's guidance for peace mediation processes in Yemen and Syria, specific training materials and methodologies developed for gender inclusion in peace talks.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed references to PeaceFem app development, training resources for women in peace processes, and specific UN Women programming outcomes in regions like Yemen and Syria.

Rater 4 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific international collaborations, such as those with OECD INCAF members, are less detailed in the AI content, and direct policy engagements with UN Security Council reviews are presented more broadly.

"

"74. Study Title : Documenting and Protecting Survivors of Torture and Ill-Treatment Living in Poor Communities

Rater 1 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: - Specific workshop outcomes and partner NGO impacts. - Concrete instances of media coverage and how public awareness was raised in local communities (e.g., newspaper coverage in Kenya).

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF report provides detailed stakeholder feedback, such as specific testimonies from organizations like IMLU and practical results (e.g., app usage data). There is also mention of specific policy briefings and outcomes, such as the UN General Assembly session, which are not fully developed in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed descriptions of local organizational impact, including partnerships with entities like the Kenya-based IMLU and their development of mobile applications, are more granular in the REF submission.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed descriptions of media coverage and public debate outcomes specific to Bangladesh, Kenya, and Nepal were not fully mirrored. Key activities like the workshops and discussions led by NGOs, which contributed to policy adoption, were less emphasized.

"

"75. Study Title : Transforming genomic selection in commercial breeding programmes for pigs, dairy goats, and poultry

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific breakdowns of efficiency gains in resource use and sustainability measures (e.g., feed efficiency improvements).

Rater 2 Rating = Rating: 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific financial figures detailing economic impacts on stakeholders, year-by-year productivity improvements, and trait-specific advancements in livestock breeding (e.g., reproductive performance and leg structure improvements in pigs, and increased yield traits in goats).

Rater 3 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed figures on genetic gain percentages, cumulative financial projections for breeders, and year-over-year productivity improvements for each species

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific increases in genetic merit, specific countries/markets (e.g., UK, China), and detailed gains in genetic traits specific to each species (e.g., feed efficiency in poultry, milk yield in goats).

"

"76. Study Title : Employing polymer physics to improve gluten-free bread structure

Rater 1 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed economic data such as company revenue, market penetration, and specific technological advancements were more thoroughly quantified in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Educational impacts through mentorship programs, career support for early-career researchers, and the development of three specific startups directly influenced by the collaboration were documented in the REF submission but were not fully represented in the AI-generated version.

Rater 3 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific historical milestones and quantifiable economic figures, such as year-over-year growth.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The mentoring programs with ECRs, specific new companies created by mentored individuals, and explicit product improvement details for gluten-free bread.

"

"77. Study Title : Peripheral Impressionisms: challenging perceptions of Impressionism

Rater 1 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed accounts of increased museum retail sales, attendance at related educational events, and detailed statements from notable art historians and directors (e.g., Christopher Baker, James Mackinnon) who confirm the significant impact on public and professional perceptions.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Precise visitor numbers across exhibition sites, individual exhibition revenue, and quantifiable auction price impacts per specific work.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Attendance and catalogue sales for the National Gallery of Scotland, specific funding received (USD600,000), and precise economic impact on related retail sales.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed metrics on funding, catalog sales, and quantifiable visitor numbers from various exhibitions are included in REF but summarized in AI.

"

"78. Study Title : Raising the profile of Scottish Literature through writing and consultancy

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The AI version missed details on measurable public engagement metrics, specifically reader and visitor counts from various exhibitions and publications.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides specific details about visitor engagement metrics for the Landmarks exhibition and detailed commentary on public responses, which are less thoroughly addressed in the AI version. The REF version also included Professor Riach's academic credentials and previous public engagements that built his profile, forming a solid foundation for the research impact claims.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Number of articles published in The National; the 30,000 copies distributed of the Traveller's Guide.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed public response metrics, such as visitor counts and direct user engagement feedback during exhibitions and publications.

"

"79. Study Title : Secukinumab becomes the first interleukin-17A inhibitor approved for psoriatic arthritis

Rater 1 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version provides a more detailed view of Novartis' involvement in clinical trial stages and stakeholder engagement, underscoring the company's direct influence on drug development and distribution.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on the autoinjector's impact on patient adherence and convenience, specific financial outcomes such as detailed sales metrics for Novartis' secukinumab.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The specific role of patient outcomes over extended periods (e.g., two-year benchmarks in FUTURE studies).

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: In-depth explanations of each clinical phase (e.g., FUTURE trials), specific outcomes of each trial phase, and comprehensive patient quality-of-life metrics.

"

"80. Study Title : Establishing the Facts, Developing Professionalisation and Enabling Transparent 'Pilgrim-centred' Communication in the UK Hajj Sector

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF content emphasized qualitative insights from British Muslim pilgrim organizations, media partnerships, and more detailed descriptions of specific APPG meetings. Key media highlights, such as Deutsche Welle's billion-view reach, were also specified in REF but not replicated in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed stakeholder interactions, particularly those that led to regulatory changes and the development of LHO guidelines; specifics on the 25% rise in Hajj costs affecting pilgrims.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific consultations in London, Birmingham, and with CBHUK, and specific stakeholder endorsements of McLoughlin's research as "transformative."

Rater 4 Rating = 5 - Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed account of regional consultations and the specific impact of McLoughlin's report on fraud awareness and the Hajj market within the UK.

"

"81. Study Title : A Bridge for Spies: Overcoming the Practitioner-Academic Gap in Intelligence and Security

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF emphasized agency-specific impacts such as the training frameworks in the Intelligence Academy, NCA external engagement protocols, and the nuanced adoption of Dover's recommendations by national intelligence sectors.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific procedural adjustments within NATO's intelligence assessments, with direct quotes from NATO officers on impact, and specific training developments unique to NCA protocols for engaging external academics.

Rater 3 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed program outcomes from the Five Eyes collaboration, including the development and adoption of training standards, are discussed in the REF but absent in the ChatGPT version.

Rater 4 Rating = 3: Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Extensive coverage of the Five Eyes collaboration; structured impacts on security, including training protocols and the formal role of NATO in analyst professionalization.

"

"82. Study Title : Influencing Labour Standards and Stakeholder Action Through International, European and National Law and Policy

Rater 1 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific references to the Global Deal's adoption across 100 parties and 99 commitments, as well as unique metrics (e.g., video viewership at the UNGA), which demonstrate visibility and reach, are detailed in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version mentions distinct impacts on specific labor policies in Greece, insights shared with South Africa's labor organizations, and comprehensive ILO collaborations aimed at gender equality policies in specific sectors.

Rater 3 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Direct quotations or citations from ILO and UN statements verifying Koukiadaki's influence, which lend credibility and specificity to the REF submission.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics on collective bargaining resolutions, precise statistics on policy endorsements, the role of entities like the ILO and ETUC, and policy endorsement events such as the UNGA participation and audience reach data.

"

"83. Study Title : Creating Value and Transforming Lives through Arts and Creative Media Practice

Rater 1 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF version specifies the exact mechanisms of community-led projects like the "Compound 13 Lab" in Dharavi, and the role of individuals (e.g., Expert Lead appointed for Gdansk) that are essential to the detailed comprehensiveness.

Rater 2 Rating = 5: Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific methods of public engagement, such as ""Govan/Gdansk Streetlevel Photoworks"" exhibitions, were more precisely identified in the REF submission.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific heritage protection outcomes, detailed list of international academic and NGO partnerships, and influence on educational and public health frameworks.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific instances where the research led to actionable policy changes, such as Glasgow City Council's decision reversal and the application for World Heritage status.

"

"84. Study Title : A Transformation in Creep Condition Monitoring for High Temperature, High Pressure Components

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed policy and industry standards contribution (e.g., ASME approval) for international standards on welding practices, as well as recognition by South African institutions for contributions to economic resilience and infrastructure reliability. Additional industrial impacts, especially the impact on reducing unplanned power outages and achieving ASME certification for broader deployment in the nuclear industry.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: South African award recognitions and ESASTAP collaboration, specific economic data tied to NMU's revenue growth from the technology.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Recognition of WeldCore's impact in South Africa, specific economic contributions to eNtsa, and details of SASOL's annual condition monitoring benefits were included in REF but absent in ChatGPT.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Local recognition through awards, specific impact on South Africa's power stability, and the socio-economic benefits derived from reduced unplanned outages at ESKOM.

"
"85. Study Title : The creation (and re-creation) of contemporary female heroines at the center of new plays for the theatre.

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: In-depth stakeholder impacts (e.g., actors' perspectives and career influence), and specifics on collaborations with Scottish theatres and festivals (e.g., Citizens Theatre's program for women).

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Programming changes at Citizens Theatre, Glasgow, and Edinburgh International Festival, awards won by actors in Harris's productions, and detailed attendance metrics.

Rater 3 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed programmatic outcomes for each theatre and festival (e.g., Edinburgh International Festival's program composition and audience demographics) were missing from the ChatGPT summary, alongside the nuanced breakdown of translations and adaptations.

Rater 4 Rating = [3 - Good]

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific names of prominent theatres, full list of translations into 11 languages, and notable milestones of individual plays such as critical acclaim, award nominations, and record audience numbers for certain venues.

"
"86. Study Title : Changes to cervical screening policies following the rollout of human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission includes the collaborative engagement with Scottish policymakers and specific policy panels such as the JCVI. It also detailed responses from policymakers that substantiate the research's influence.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Economic evaluations (e.g., cost-efficiency of HPV over cytology) and impacts on specific NHS workflows (e.g., colposcopy referral rates) were present in REF but not in AI-generated impacts.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Minor details, such as detailed feedback from specific stakeholders (e.g., the UK National Screening Committee's reactions), were included in the REF submission but generalized in the AI version.

Rater 4 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The specific impact of predictive value changes on colposcopy referrals, reflecting the program's technical adaptation needs.

"
"87. Study Title : Combating Crop Losses and Improving Global Food Supplies through Mathematical Modelling of "Gene Silencing"

Rater 1 Rating = 5 - Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Some details, such as specific project outcomes (yield percentage increases by crop type and direct quotes from regional agricultural leaders), were presented in the REF submission with greater specificity. Additionally, the recognition awards (e.g., Letter of Gratitude) and institutional honors mentioned in the REF were not included in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on agricultural policy influence (e.g., reductions in pesticide use as a policy goal), specific impacts on local employment in the Ukrainian agricultural sector, and stakeholder engagement processes.

Rater 3 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed testimonials from agricultural stakeholders, and specific mentions of pest control cost reductions

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed statistics on yield improvements per crop type, costs saved through reduced pesticide usage, and specific regional metrics in Ukraine.

"

"88. Study Title : Emerging Media, Learning, and Organisational Practice - Driving Change in Tourism and Education in Northern Ireland

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Extensive detail on localized impacts on Northern Ireland's tourism and educational infrastructure; particular initiatives like "Generation Animation" and its role in upskilling staff for educational and technological resilience.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific stakeholder feedback from educational institutions, detailed impact narratives from local councils, and precise descriptions of adaptive strategies developed due to Jackson's research.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific contributions of Jackson's work in informing tourism projects at CCGBC and MHT, as well as the AGENCY project's influence on Northern Ireland educational strategies (dimensions I1, I2, I4).

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed engagements with local councils (CCGBC, MHT) on implementing AR and app-based strategies; Jackson's recommendations affecting council resource allocation and cost-benefit analysis; impacts on specific school pedagogies and the 'third teacher' learning concept.

"

"89. Study Title : Global adoption of the Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) into clinical practice

Rater 1 Rating = 5 - Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Financial outcomes: Specific revenue details from licensing agreements (e.g., £3.5 million revenue) and exact adoption statistics (e.g., increase in electronic format requests post-validation) are highlighted in the REF version but are more generalized in the AI-generated content.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Quantitative data on DLQI licenses issued, inclusion in specific country guidelines, and DLQI's role in the effectiveness of particular drug trials.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission mentions specifics of DLQI's use in chronic conditions and its impact on drug development for dermatological therapies.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Country-specific guideline additions (e.g., 45 countries and new ones like New Zealand, Germany, China); a detailed breakdown of licensing revenues and e-DLQI implementation figures; and the MCID score adjustments' specific implications.

"

"90. Study Title : Improving the healthcare experiences of children and young people

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission included specific examples of ongoing collaborations, including with organizations like Crohn's & Colitis UK and the RRN, which bolster the research's implementation pathway. It also elaborated on the use of qualitative and quantitative data for ongoing feedback loops, which was underdeveloped in the AI version.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Full details of NHS implementation, feedback mechanisms, and specific co-creation processes (e.g., drama workshops with children).

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed training

sessions conducted by the research team, feedback from healthcare providers, and influence on specific clinical protocols at NHS hospitals.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The original submission highlights specific activities, such as direct involvement in healthcare training programs and policy briefs directed at healthcare regulators, adding depth to the impact case study.

"

"91. Study Title : The value of the Carers' Alert Thermometer (CAT) in identifying family carers' needs and supporting them in their caring role

Rater 1 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of the CAT being embedded in training programs with GSF, its role in family-focused adaptations for MND, and applications for stroke and young carer support. These details demonstrate the wide-reaching applications and specific practical uses that contribute to CAT's impact comprehensiveness.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Explicit use cases of CAT with stroke and MND carers, including adaptations for young carers. 2. Testimonial evidence from carers and healthcare professionals on CAT's real-time benefits and challenges in deployment.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission specifies detailed examples such as the CAT's adaptation for young carers and specific user feedback, which the ChatGPT version generalized without specific anecdotes.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Adoption by specific institutions such as Princess Margaret Cancer Centre and the training programs initiated under the Gold Standards Framework.

"

"92. Study Title : God-complexity and the Multiple God-Aspects Framework

Rater 1 Rating = 4 - Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed conference presentations, pilot study findings, and specific impacts on clinical populations like Christian and non-Christian groups.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics of longitudinal study outcomes, particular emphasis on multicultural and religious perspectives (e.g., Muslim focus groups), and specific clinical collaborations (e.g., with Christian Mental Health centers).

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Pilot testing with the Centre for Research and Innovation in Christian Mental Health Care; specific conference engagements and public blog metrics.

Rater 4 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of longitudinal data application to measure well-being and unique aspects of cultural influence on different religious groups.

"

"93. Study Title : Abertay Game Lab: play, performance, and public engagement with games

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Quantified visitor and audience demographics, specific game developer testimonials, financial impacts on exhibition income for the Dundee exhibition, and visitor engagement metrics for cultural and social play events.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The REF submission provides granular insights into the visitor impact at the V&A exhibitions, specific organizational outcomes for museums (e.g., Culture Perth and Kinross), and details on event attendees and testimonies from industry stakeholders.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF submission included distinct impacts on Scottish Game Developers Association, Culture Perth and Kinross,

and the V&A Museum, with quantifiable data on exhibitions. ChatGPT lacked this level of stakeholder specificity.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific impacts on audience development metrics at cultural events, increase in visitor numbers at exhibitions, and detailed testimonials from partners.

"

"94. Study Title : Improving Care for Patients with Chronic and Distressing Tinnitus through Mindfulness Based Interventions

Rater 1 Rating = 5 - Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1) The integration of MBCT-t into specific policy recommendations, such as the NICE guidelines for tinnitus management; 2) Detailed patient outcomes and satisfaction metrics like re-referral rates and specific patient testimonials that emphasize impact.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Economic impact specifics, such as estimated cost savings for healthcare services and training programs for audiologists at RNENTDH and UCL.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed patient feedback quotes, specific changes in satisfaction and re-referral rates, and the role of specific institutions like RNENTDH in promoting MBCT in clinical practice.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Explicit training programs for clinicians, specific patient satisfaction survey results, and quantitative economic savings due to reduced re-referral rates.

"

"95. Study Title : Developing and Embedding Effective Careers Guidance for Young People in England

Rater 1 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Quantitative impact details, such as statistics on Career Leader training programs, the specific responses of different schools, and evidence of outcomes on student grades and engagement in the pilot programs.

Rater 2 Rating = 4: Very Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific policies related to the Department for Education and exact figures on career leader training uptake were provided in the REF submission but not detailed in the ChatGPT version. The REF also mentions particular endorsements in international forums (e.g., the CLAP project in Hong Kong and Wales' educational review), which adds specific scope not as detailed in the AI version.

Rater 3 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Training specifics (2400 teachers), Careers Leaders' role and training requirement, and exact regional adoption (North East of England and Wales).

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Regional adaptations in the UK and pilot programs for primary schools were detailed in the REF version but only generally referenced by the AI.

"

"96. Study Title : Design meets disability: changing the relationship between disability and design in business, culture, practice, and education

Rater 1 Rating = 5 - Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed experiential data from the V&A Dundee exhibition, including public engagement metrics (e.g., 100,000 visitors), which add practical insight into audience reach.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: 1. Detailed public engagement through exhibitions and published articles, which drew extensive public and media attention (e.g., The New York Times feature). 2. Insights into corporate-level cultural shifts within Microsoft's 50,000-employee inclusivity program.

Rater 3 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on exhibitions like "Hands of X" at V&A Dundee, and specific media coverage were omitted in the AI

version, which could impact perceived cultural reach.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The role of exhibitions as a societal outreach tool, mentions of key individuals within movements, and direct testimonies from disabled participants in cultural settings.

"

"97. Study Title : Digital Archiving for Curation and Dissemination

Rater 1 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: REF includes mentions of specific exhibits, such as the Sao Paolo exhibition and the Kill Your TV program, which contextualize reach within media and public exposure.

Rater 2 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Student training benefits, long-term economic support for cultural sector

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific examples of cultural events and exhibitions in cities like Tokyo, Berlin, and Gdansk, which expanded the reach of the project.

Rater 4 Rating = 3

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specifics on the acquisition and integration of archives with international museums and the exact educational collaborations.

"

"98. Study Title : Prevention and management of head injuries in cricket and rugby union

Rater 1 Rating = 3 - Good

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed data on training programs and the direct involvement of certain stakeholders like the Welsh Rugby Union and ECB, including phased updates to education programs and team-based surveillance details.

Rater 2 Rating = 4 (Very Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed pathways to policy implementation, including pre- and post-publication engagement with stakeholders like sports governing bodies, were missing in ChatGPT. Also, educational courses for players and the incremental funding phases were less detailed.

Rater 3 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on stakeholder engagement, such as direct collaboration with helmet manufacturers and sports governing bodies; emphasis on professional training initiatives for team doctors and referees.

Rater 4 Rating = 5

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: The AI version did not emphasize some of the more localized impacts in Welsh rugby, such as specific training for coaches and players in Wales. These community-level impacts, although less universal, are significant in evaluating comprehensive local uptake.

"

"99. Study Title : The Kindertransport 1938/1939 to the UK: History Informing the Future

Rater 1 Rating = 5 - Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific mentions of the different exhibition locations (e.g., Berlin, London) and feedback from specific stakeholders who attended these events provide localized insights into the impact of the exhibitions, which the AI-generated content summarizes more generally without location-specific details.

Rater 2 Rating = 3 (Good)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Details on individual exhibition feedback, targeted impacts on Welsh Government policy, and in-depth geographic specificity (e.g., the precise locales and dates of specific exhibitions and workshops).

Rater 3 Rating = 5 - Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed references to specific exhibitions and talks contributing to the educational and societal impact.

Rater 4 Rating = 4

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific public engagement details, such as talks with former Kindertransportees and their role in shaping individual historical understanding, were not elaborated in the AI version. The impact on mental health awareness, especially concerning post-trauma implications, was also less emphasized.

"

"100. Study Title : An evidence-based approach reduces the local costs of biodiversity conservation in low- and middle-income countries

Rater 1 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: A few specific collaborations, such as detailed engagement with biodiversity consultancies like The Biodiversity Consultancy and feedback from stakeholders on practical guidelines, are more deeply elaborated in the REF submission.

Rater 2 Rating = 5: Excellent

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: More specific details on implementation challenges faced during the REDD+ projects, especially on local communities' compensation systems and gaps in IFC standard adherence.

Rater 3 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Detailed results of the IUCN-guided consultations and the role of specific development agencies like the French Development Agency in implementing the study's recommendations.

Rater 4 Rating = 5 (Excellent)

CR Related Aspects Mentioned in REF Submission but not in ChatGPT Version: Specific quotations from stakeholders are notably missing from ChatGPT, which are emphasized in the REF submission, especially where corporate, governmental, and community leaders have responded to Bangor's research.

"